

**Creation**

**Social Science and Humanities**

**QUARTERLY**



# CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

This **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

**Voting membership** is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of the CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis:

- a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or
- b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. **Statement of Belief**. Sustaining membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) per year.

**Officers:** Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

**Editor:** Dr. Paul D. Ackerman

**Board of Reference:** Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis, Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Mr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.



# Editorial

Dear Readers:

A most interesting thing happened last week at the university where I teach. A young woman named Cindy Lasseter came to the campus, marched out to the main entrance of our student union and began to preach. She was marvelous in terms of her ability as an orator, and her subject was the gospel of Jesus and punishment in hell for sinners. She told the story of the way her life had been as a student at the University of Florida and how she had been converted to Christ as a result of a similar person preaching on that campus. She kept reminding those who gathered to listen of the horrible prevalence of sin in the lives of modern Americans and the terrible danger for those who refused to repent and believe the gospel.

Very shortly a tremendous crowd gathered around her. The whole campus was buzzing with the news of Cindy's visit. For four days she returned to preach, and each time it was the same with curious students pressing to get closer to hear. The most visible reaction was loud jeering and ridicule. At times the crowd was like an ugly mob. Some of the more vocal of the students shouted abuse and hateful denunciations. Yet she continued on unshaken by the storm around her. As I watched all this I wanted so much to talk with her privately for a moment. I wanted to let her know that there were Christians on the campus that loved her and appreciated her coming. I just wanted to give her a word of support and encouragement. Her last day on campus was Friday of that week. She had finished talking, and the crowd had dispersed.

I had been at a meeting and was walking back toward my office. I wanted to see on the way if she might still be around. I looked, but there was no sign of her. One of my colleagues noticed me looking around and said, "Are you looking for Cindy?" I said I was, and my colleague pointed, "There she is." I saw her in the distance walking toward the student union. I caught up with her, and we spoke for a moment as I expressed my support and appreciation. I also shared with her a couple of positive things that God had already accomplished through her visit.

There was one experience while listening to her preach that meant much to me personally. I have heard preaching many times, but I had never heard it accompanied by jeering and ugly shouting. In that atmosphere the message did not sound foolish or "old fashioned" as it sometimes had on the radio, TV, etc. It sounded up-to-date, urgent, timely and — beautiful. Yes, beautiful! Beauty in a way I had not appreciated before.

With regard to his own generation Jesus once said, "We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned to you, and ye have not wept." The modern creation science movement with its many empirical proofs in its way is piping the gospel to a lost and dying generation, but they so very often refuse to dance. Gospel preachers such as Cindy Lasseter cry out to our generation the mournful song of "... repent and turn to God, performing deeds appropriate to repentance," but so very often they refuse to weep. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

- Paul D. Ackerman

CSSH Quarterly  
Vol. V, No. 2 (Winter 1982)

# LETTERS AND COMMENTS

Dear Editor:

This is to thank Ellen Myers for both her excellent articles in the *CSSH Quarterly* (Fall 1982).

It occurred to me that she might find a great weight of support for what she had to say from recent writings on gnosticism, particularly the book by Hans Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion*, published by the Beacon Press. Elaine Pagel's book is helpful but I think it falls short of the impressiveness of Jonas.

The Rev. T. Robert Ingram, D.D.  
P.O. Box 35096  
Houston, Texas 77235

Peace, health and everlasting salvation be to you through our Lord Jesus Christ. I pray for your ministry often. It has been such an inspiration to me. Ellen Myers' articles have been so perceptive and have helped me to understand the humanism and paganism of so many of the men I read in college. Keep up the good work.

C. Joe Sturz, M.A.  
401 W. First St., Suite 2  
P.O. Box 7062  
Greenville, N.C. 27834

I consider the *Quarterly* an oasis in the desert of contemporary literature. Please keep up the good work!

Carol Armstrong  
7530 Twelve Oaks Blvd.  
Tampa, Florida 33614

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

*Wealth for All*, an excellent new book on politics and economics from the Biblical creation perspective by one of our members, Mr. R.E. McMaster, Jr., has just been published. It is available at \$7.50 per copy (50% reduction of the regular retail price) if ordered through us. We will forward your orders to Mr. McMaster so you can take advantage of this special rate. Send your order to us and make out your check to "A.N., Inc."

We will review this fine book in the Spring 1983 *CSSH Quarterly*.

Volumes I through IV of the *CSSH Quarterly*, all of which are now out of print, are now available on microfiche (one volume per microfiche), at \$10.00 per volume or \$30.00 the set. Special reduced rates are available to CSSHS members and subscribers. Inquire for further details.



# Is Creation More Than A Biological Model of Origins?

Ralph E. Ancil

From about the 16th century onward, and especially during the so-called "Enlightenment," there occurred a growth of secular, non-Christian ideas. Philosophers embraced rationalism: the belief that man can understand everything without God or divine revelation; and naturalism: the belief that there is nothing of supernatural significance in man in either thought or deed. Politically, rulers embraced the notion of the "Divine Right of Kings" which was exaggerated to the point of bordering on a return to pagan deification of the State and rejection of the Christian concept which places the king under God and His Law. Such absolutist thinking increased and centralized governmental power which included the accumulation of wealth. This resulted in territorial expansion, international conflict and generally a focus on economic and material interest.<sup>1</sup> A bifurcation of thought occurred in the sciences as a growing number of secular thinkers tried to break the strong, natural alliance of science and religion. Increasingly, science became linked with a secular perspective in which the world was seen as a materialistic machine governed not by a caring and sustaining God, but by impersonal autonomous "laws."

By the 19th century the secular world view had become firmly entrenched in key areas of thought. It was in this historical setting that Charles Darwin published (in 1859) *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. Although other writers had presented essentially evolutionary ideas before him, Darwin's emphasis on natural selection gave his explanation the appearance of "scientific" validity.<sup>2</sup> It was materialistic and mechanistic and thus suited the age. As one observer notes:

"By the end of the century, hardly a field of thought remained unfertilized by the 'new' concept. Historians had begun looking at the past as 'a living organism'; legal theorists studied the law as a developing social institution; critics studied the evolution of literary types; anthropologists and sociologists invoked 'natural selection' in their studies of social forms . . ."<sup>3</sup>

Today the concept of evolution is so rooted in virtually every area of thought in Western culture, that any attack upon it must have consequences of the utmost importance. William Erwin Thompson reports that he was surprised one day to learn that a professor in California did not consider the "theory" of evolution to be "proved." Thompson thought only religious fanatics could doubt the proof of evolution.

He writes:

"... since I saw myself as definitely on the side of science against religion, I positioned myself in the matter without a thought for what

Ralph E. Ancil receives his mail at 1119 Kimberly Dr., #4, Lansing, MI 48912.

CSSH Quarterly  
Vol. V, No. 2 (Winter 1982)

was really only a matter of snobbery."<sup>4</sup>

After considering some problems of human evolution, Thompson concludes:

"The Darwinian theory of human evolution by natural selection, which triumphed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, may fall apart into newly structured pieces in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Such an intellectual event would bring about the most overwhelming and profound changes in the intellectual's world view

..."<sup>5</sup>

It is important, then, to examine a few of the profound changes which might arise from the adoption of a creation model of origins. Is the creation model of origins capable of bringing about these "profound changes" of which Thompson speaks? In other words, is the creation model more than just a biological account of origins? Does it have far reaching social implications? In attempting to answer this question we will examine some of the major features of the Creation concept and contrast them with those of the evolution belief.

### THE FOUR MAJOR TRAITS

The first level of comparison involves noting the major features of the two origins concepts. Let's look at the traits of the evolution model:

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Indefinite, endless change:                                | open-ended  |
| 2. Simple to Complex with unlimited variation (going on now): | progressive |
| 3. Chance and Impersonal "Laws" (natural selection):          | mechanistic |
| 4. No ultimate point of reference:                            | purposeless |

The Creation model on the other hand has these traits:

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| 1. Completed and final:  | closure    |
| 2. Involves simultaneous and successive events followed by conservation:(distinct) | constant   |
| 3. God's care and sustenance:  | theistic   |
| 4. Point of reference or purpose:  | teleologic |

The features of these biological models are often transferred to various aspects of society. For example, on evolutionary premises, moral questions are open-ended or debatable. Changes in morality are considered "progress" and in the end none of it matters anyway. A creationist, on the other hand, would be inclined to see *closure* on moral questions. Some things are definitely right, some definitely wrong. He sees morality as permanent or constant.

The evolutionist approaches society on a legalistic or mechanistic basis because he feels that the manipulation of social "mechanisms" will bring the desired results. The creationist believes God acts in human society as well as in the material world, governing all things, and so the proper conduct of society involves more than mechanistic manipulation of social institutions.

These then are the four major features of each model as they are applied in society. We may now examine the contrasting models in relation to certain key aspects of society.

### LANGUAGE

Evolutionists see the world as one of process, of continuous change and of



endless progress. Evolutionary semanticists naturally question how the fixity which characterizes language can represent such a world. They are, in other words, completely committed to the view of "becoming": nothing ever *is*; everything only *becomes*.<sup>6</sup> Instead of seeing language as reflecting conceptions of verities, evolutionary semanticists hold that language reflects only qualities of perceptions. They therefore attempt to remove the philosophic inclination of language, i.e., they try to eliminate all character and teleology from it.<sup>7</sup>

This attitude is especially evident in the natural sciences. For example, Baker and Allan indicated that teleological expressions have no place in biological explanations, though they concede that such expressions are sometimes hard to avoid and that even they themselves may occasionally "slip". Thus a sentence describing that a cell takes in glucose "in order to" increase its energy supply constitutes an unfortunate expression because the phrase "in order to" connotes purpose.<sup>8</sup>

Richard Weaver comments on the relation of language and science and notes that the empirical community of science must avail itself of the meta-physical community of language.<sup>9</sup> As Wilber Marshall Urban put it:

"It is part of my general thesis that all meaning is ultimately linguistic and that although science, in the interests of purer notation and manipulation may break through the husk of language, its non-linguistic symbols must again be translated back into natural language if intelligibility is to be possible."<sup>10</sup>

Hence, when evolutionary semanticists undermine language they ultimately undermine science.

One important area of science is systematics, the categorizing or *naming* of plants and animals. To define something requires that it be placed in a category and distinguished from other things. Again Weaver writes:

"The limits of the definition are thus the boundary between the things and the not-thing."<sup>11</sup>

But evolutionists do not recognize any inherent limit to variations but instead tend to minimize the very differences of distinction and discreteness needed for sound systematics. Perhaps this is the reason why Dr. Colin Patterson of the British Museum of Natural History has recently declared that evolution has the function of knowledge but conveys none:

"Explanatory value of the hypothesis of common ancestry is nil. . . I feel that the effects of hypotheses of common ancestry in systematics has not been merely boring, not just a lack of knowledge, I think it has been positively anti-knowledge."<sup>12</sup>

And so Dr. Patterson and others have abandoned the belief in common ancestry and rely upon similarities of structures in their systematics.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, we find that acceptance of the Creation model implies a greater view of the importance of language. God spoke and it was so (Gen. 1); He gave the word and it is; He sustains all things by the word of His power (Heb. 1:3). The creation account emphasizes that the world is finished and it is not *becoming* eternally. This fact, in turn, harmonizes with the natural fixity of language. While evolutionary semanticists feel that they must break through the veil of language to get at reality, the creation account implies that language is the vehicle to (higher) reality and indeed that language shapes material reality. God demonstrates His dominion over the world through His language. And Adam, created in God's Image, demonstrated his dominion over the

animals by naming them. (Perhaps he was the first taxonomist.)

The acceptance of a creationist view of origins leads to a more elevated view of language and to a respect for words as real things and the truths they contain.

## PROPERTY

With the rise of socialism came the cry that the means of production ought not to be privately owned. We have noticed in recent years increasing regulation at the national level of private property. It is legitimate then to ask on what basis can we justify the private ownership of property?

Dr. Raleigh Barlowe writes:

"Most authorities agree that our concept of property rights is really the outgrowth of a long period of evolutionary development."<sup>14</sup>

This evolution is believed to have been like this: first, no ownership (all free goods), then, tribal/communal ownership and finally, private ownership. Dr. Barlowe seems to think that *ultimately* property rights rest with society.

With such an evolutionary view of property, it is not surprising that liberties are taken with property in socialist countries. We, in this country, have enjoyed a tradition of respect for private property, although some socialist inroads in the government control of private property have occurred.

Not all evolutionists are socialists, but socialists are evolutionists. To the extent evolution has contributed to a socialist view, it has become a threat to private property. (Karl Marx, for example, wanted to dedicate his book *Das Kapital* to Darwin; Darwin declined.<sup>15</sup>)

What about the creationist position? What basis do we have in the creation model for private property? T. Robert Ingram writing in the *Creation Research Society Quarterly* states:

"Man's power to own property is likewise derived solely from the Divine command to have dominion. Blackstone wrote of the right of dominion as the right of property (Bk. II, Cap. 1). Then:

'In the beginning of the world, we are informed by holy writ, that an all-bountiful Creator gave to man "dominion over the earth."  
... This is the only true and solid foundation of man's dominion over external things, whatever any metaphysical notions may have been stated by fanciful writers upon this subject.'

The rest of the statutes securing man's dominion over all things punish violations of his authority over his wife, his goods, his real property, his good name and his vulnerability to fraud."<sup>16</sup>

The acceptance of the creation account of origins implies the acceptance of private property. It provides the justification for private property and the moral obligation to defend it.

## ECOLOGY

Many people are concerned over the quality of the natural environment, but to find remedies for these problems is quite complex. Yet one contributing factor is surely our attitude to the natural world. What shapes this attitude? What has been the attitude in the past? Does our view of origins make any difference?

In this regard Richard Hofstadter<sup>17</sup> in his book *Social Darwinism in American Thought* demonstrates that the captains of industry in the last century



were Social Darwinists, i.e., they believed that the Darwinian concept of evolution was more than just a model of origins. It was also a social model, and so they sought to apply evolutionary thought to society. Such men included John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and Chauncy De Pew. These men believed that just as individual organisms must struggle for life against their environment in the process of evolution, so too, businessmen must fight their natural and social environments in ruthless competition to survive financially. This was seen as the way of life and of *progress*. William Graham Sumner, a leading Social Darwinist, wrote that nature is a "hard mistress," and "opponent" against whom men must strive for the means of subsistence. Men "wrestle" with nature to extort from her what they need.<sup>18</sup>

Charles Eliot Norton (1861) commented that nature is careless of the single life: "Her processes seem wasteful, but of seeming waste, she produces her great and durable results."<sup>19</sup>

Darwin himself remarked that wastefulness, strife and warfare were the essential elements in the evolutionary progress of nature.<sup>20</sup>

With such a hostile attitude toward nature, it is not difficult to see how certain patterns of thought, how certain businesses and industrial practices, could be established and passed on into this century and thereby contribute to our environmental problems.

But if Christians accept the Genesis account of origins and recognize its social implications, they must see that they have a duty to God to be stewards of His creation. Adam was installed in the Garden of Eden and commanded to "dress it and keep it", i.e., to cultivate and conserve it (or take care of it). His commission to have "dominion" did not give Adam the license to *abuse* God's earth, or to do anything he wanted to do. Rather he was given the authority commensurate to his responsibility for a purpose: to care for the earth. This is similar to the authority Potiphar gave Joseph; he *entrusted* him with all he had. Had Joseph violated that trust he would have been removed from his position (as he indeed was due to the wife's accusation).

Today evolutionary environmentalists demand many things in the name of the environment. Some of these goals Christians can agree with, such as recycling of materials, conservation of resources, etc. But many of their goals are clearly unacceptable such as abortion, sterilization, contraceptives for minors, global government and massive unilateral disarmament.<sup>21</sup> It is in this area that Christians have the opportunity to present an alternative to evolutionary thinking, one which will allow man to exercise a dominion of stewardship in harmony with basic Judeo-Christian values. The acceptance of the creation account implies the acceptance of a moral obligation to God to take care of His handiwork. Respect for the Creator requires respect for His Creation.

## PATRIARCHY

We have heard much in recent years of the "advances for progress" in the so-called feminist movement. And yet what is the basis for this movement? In reviewing the history of it we find that it started in the last century. It is essentially a socialist/evolutionist world view advocated by such well-known evolutionists as Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in their *Communist Manifesto* and later by Engels in his book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State* and by John Stuart Mill in his book *On the Subjection of Women*. We

are therefore not surprised to learn that leading "feminists" hold to a socialistic/evolutionary world view.

The goals of feminism are nothing less than the complete overthrow of our present system of society which is patriarchal, i.e., male dominated. Dr. Daniel Amneus gives some examples:<sup>22</sup>

1. Feminist Betsy Warrior believes that men are obsolete and should all be killed (or for those too squeamish about the mass-killing of men, she advocates zoos or man-preserves).
2. Equal rightist Sheila Cronan writes that freedom for women cannot be won without the abolition of marriage.
3. Jill Johnston dedicates her book *Lesbian Nation: The Feminist Solution* for "my mother who should've been a lesbian. And for my daughter in hopes she will be." Miss Johnston looks forward to the end of patriarchal Christianity.

These statements are typical of feminist leaders and although not all equalitarians may advocate these measures, they nonetheless make common cause with these goals when they support the "equal rights" movement.

What has been the effect of the wide-spread acceptance of the feminist cause? Has it been good? Are we a healthier, happier society because of it? Are women better off?

Dr. Daniel Amneus in his book *Back to Patriarchy* and other writers (e.g., George Gilder) have provided a great deal of evidence to show that feminism has been devastating to our society. They argue, for instance, that feminism has contributed 1) to the growth of federal bureaucracies and consequent growth of government power;<sup>23</sup> 2) to child abuse; the worst abusers are women estranged from their husbands;<sup>24</sup> 3) to economic failure; women are not as productive in the work force and the feminist reliance on government is subsidized by taxes;<sup>25</sup> 4) to warfare by driving men to greater acts of aggression and savagery;<sup>26</sup> 5) to the collectivization or socialization of American society (e.g., day care centers for the indoctrination of the young);<sup>27</sup> 6) to increasing divorces due to the financial independence of women;<sup>28</sup> 7) to the decline of our national defenses due to the incorporation of women into the military;<sup>29</sup> and 8) to the male identity crisis.<sup>30</sup>

Yet what does the creation account of Genesis suggest with respect to the roles of men and women? We find in the Genesis account that God instituted marriage and the family. The family is not an equalitarian institution; it is hierarchical with children in submission to the parents and the wife in submission to her husband in Christ. Since society is an extension of the family, it follows that society is hierarchical, not equalitarian; and is to be male dominated. We also find a basis for fraternity (as in Cain's question "Am I my brother's keeper?"). Fraternity implies love and tolerance. One does not expect the same duties or actions from little brother as one does from big brother.

Hence, hierarchy and fraternity go together and are implied in the family and society and have a unifying effect. But the concept of *equality* is not found in the Genesis account. Fraternity and equality are opposite concepts. Equality implies self-sufficiency (not needing someone else) and thus destroys the bonds of mutual obligation and duty upon which all families and societies are built. It therefore has a shattering or atomizing effect.<sup>31</sup>

The Apostle Paul in his writings referred to the creation account and noted that male headship was due because: 1) Adam was created first (primacy); 2)



the man is the glory of God but woman is the glory of man; 3) woman was made for man as helper (not the other way around); and 4) woman was deceived by Satan, not the man. We can also point to another indication that the men are to take the lead, i.e., to hold authority in society, by noting the importance of *naming* in the Genesis account. Plato and other thinkers have identified the *name-giver* as a *law-giver* for the law proceeds on the basis of assigning the correct name to a crime or event.<sup>32</sup> Science, too, depends on correctly naming plants and animals (taxonomy). God, in the creation account, demonstrated his authority over man by naming him (Gen. 5:2). So, too, Adam demonstrated his lordship over the animals by naming them (Gen. 2:19) and he also demonstrated his authority over his wife by naming her: first as woman (out of man, Gen. 2:23) and later as Eve (mother of all living things, Gen. 3:20).

We have then in the creation account, not only support for the principle of patriarchy, but also an explanation of its origin. It is the creation account which explains why *all societies* of which we have knowledge (both past and present) have been and are today male dominated. Steven Goldberg documents this fact very well in his book *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*.<sup>33</sup>

Surely the acceptance of an evolutionary world view has contributed to the acceptance of feminism. Just as surely a return to the biblical view, i.e., the creation view of origins, implies ■ return to patriarchy.

## GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMICS

In the present situation of America, we find a large national government bloated with bureaucracies; we find a similar situation at the state and sometimes at the local level. Millions of men are out of work and inflation continues to plague us. Many writers believe that we will continue the trend toward greater centralization and government control, especially at the national level.

But again we find that in turning to the creation model of origins we are given some ideas that relate to the nature of good human government. First, we note that before the worldwide flood of Noah there was apparently no form of human government, at least not as we now think of it. The record is quite emphatic that beginning with Cain's murder of Abel mankind grew progressively more violent until God saw fit to wipe man out of existence save but ■ few. After the worldwide deluge, God commanded Noah that any man who took another man's life forfeited his own life (Gen. 9:5,6). In other words Noah was charged to execute capital punishment for capital offenses. This is the cornerstone of human government: punishment of crime, for man is inherently evil.

About that same time another event occurred which gives us insight into the kind of government that pleases (or displeases) God. Man had been commanded to disperse into the earth to populate it. But Nimrod, a mighty hunter in opposition to Jehovah, began building cities and centralizing people. The city of Babylon itself was quite presumptuous for the builders decided to build a tower that would reach into the heavens, thus keeping all the people concentrated around Babylon. We know what happened. God confused their language and dispersed them. As the well-known creation writer, Dr. Henry M. Morris comments in his book *The Genesis Record*:

"Men had proved unwilling to obey God's simple instructions to fill the

earth, dividing into many separate, but parallel, governmental units. They preferred to remain together under one great centralized and highly regimented government and this union had quickly led to a vast unified anti-God religious philosophy as well."<sup>34</sup>

Apparently, highly centralized governmental control is not pleasing to God.

When considering the modern American political scene we frequently hear discussions of "conservatives" vs. "liberals." What exactly is meant by these terms? According to George H. Nash, conservatives consist of three basic groups: *traditionalists* (Christians); *libertarians*; and *anti-communists*.<sup>35</sup> (The *liberals* are usually "socialist" in orientation.) Let us analyze these groups. The "traditionalists" are Christians who seek to conserve those values that are embodied in godly traditions and biblical precepts. This allows room also for a free market economy, and a decentralized but authoritative government. The libertarians advocate a free-market with almost no government intervention (the *laissez-faire* doctrine). They also prefer a decentralized government but not necessarily an authoritative one. Usually, the weaker the government at all levels, the better they like it. They hold that government is inherently evil and must be restrained. They seek to maximize individual liberty and rights. In all of this they resemble what is called the "classical liberal", prominent in the last century. The anti-communists, of course, are primarily concerned about the threat of communism as advanced by the Soviet Union. They see Western civilization engaging in a great civil war, so to speak. The forces of justice and democracy stand against totalitarian oppression.

Nash's groupings, however, produce a great deal of confusion. Obviously traditionalists and libertarians are also anti-communists, and yet they will disagree with each other, on a number of important questions (abortion, pornography, etc.) Many of the anti-communists fit into the other two categories: Whittaker Chambers, a devout Quaker, clearly belongs in the Christian category, as do Russell Kirk and William F. Buckley, Jr. On the other hand, Frank Meyer was a libertarian as well as an anti-communist. Hence, it is difficult to articulate a coherent view of the "conservative" position.

I believe there is a better way of describing this situation. First, as mentioned above it must be recognized that the anti-communists are not a true separate group since both libertarians and traditionalists are against communism. Therefore, let's eliminate that group.

Next, we need to understand that both libertarians and socialists — as evolutionists — believe in (secular) progress, as representative of and reflecting a fundamental characteristic of the material universe as a whole. They disagree merely over the issue of *how* progress is to be achieved. Socialists believe it ought to be achieved through the medium of government control, while libertarians believe it ought to be achieved through the medium of market processes. Both hold to evolutionary world views. Thus, F.A. Hayek, a well-known libertarian economist, justifies the free market on evolutionary grounds: just as life and language evolved spontaneously through various kinds of interactions, so too, the free market generates a "spontaneous order."<sup>37</sup> One of F.A. Hayek's students, Ludwig Lachmann, considers the market from an endless *process* perspective; he writes:

"... the market economy is to be regarded as an ongoing process, a process essentially without beginning or end, in which general equilibrium positions are impossible; there never is a state of rest. Economic



processes are going on, changing the world all the time."<sup>38</sup> Therefore, we must categorize libertarians and socialists as being both *progressives*, not conservatives. Christians (traditionalists) want to conserve biblical values in society. They avoid the extremism of both libertarians and socialists. Thus, the new arrangement would be:

Conservatives		Progressives
Christian	vs.	a) Libertarians
(traditionalists)		b) Socialists

The dispute between libertarians and socialists goes back to the Industrial Revolution. Both sides welcomed it, and both believed that they had the answers for some of its problems (Marx believed it was the basis for socialism). Later when Charles Darwin presented his evolutionary views, both sides were quick to pick up this explanation and began viewing their economics in evolutionary terms. To the creationist, conservative, Christian this disagreement is an "in-house" dispute (much like Catholic vs. Protestant is to an atheist).

The conservative, creationist, Christian can contribute a great deal of light on the confused and misguided issues of government and economics today, but he must be careful to present sound arguments and to arrive at the right conclusions for the right reasons. Using the Bible as his standard, including and especially the Genesis account, he can be a force for good, the salt of the earth, a lamp in this evolutionary night.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we must understand the importance of origins concepts: "Why is it so important to view life with a sense of origin? . . . The events (of time) are shaped by, and gain meaning from, the one Creative Event. (A true account of origins) seeks to bring the light of the primordial, cosmogonic Event that shaped time to bear upon the events of the present . . . Consider that the incarnation of Christ is meaningful insofar as it is understood in the total order of God's revelation . . . Furthermore, without the prior fall of man, the incarnation of Christ is meaningless. Without the sense of a created perfection by God, the fall of man is meaningless."<sup>39</sup>

In other words we cannot fully understand the present until we understand the past and how the past began. We must have some understanding of what happened, "In the beginning."

We have seen that the concept of origins dominant in our society has had a profound impact on the way we live, and on the way we think. Unfortunately, it cannot be said that this impact has been good. To the contrary, the widespread acceptance of an evolutionary view of origins has contributed to the disintegration of western civilization, for it cuts right to the heart of human nature and implies that man is an animal; that everything is relative but that everything gets better on its own; that man and the world are inherently good; and that there is no god. In short, as indicated by Gillespie,<sup>40</sup> Darwins' work has greatly contributed to the "ungodding" of the universe.

Likewise, the creation model is more than just an account of biological origins. It is rich in social implications which are the opposite from those of evolutionism. Indeed, the acceptance of creation implies the acceptance of a number of other perspectives which, if widely adopted, would produce pro-

found changes in virtually every area of life. Its magnitude of impact would be no less than that of the adoption of evolution in the last century. No doubt evolutionists recognize this. Thus they are organizing to strongly oppose creationists.

Having recognized the issues and heard the evidences, both scientific and theological, we are no longer able to equivocate or seek neutral ground. We are under a moral obligation to discharge our duties to God, come what may. But will we have the courage of our convictions? Or will we limp on two opinions as the ancient Israelites did? Will we stand firmly on the side of the God of creation and His Redemption? Or will we listen to the voices of the marketplace, seek approval of the world and have our ears tickled until we are lukewarm, and Christ must vomit us out of His mouth? Will we defend Scripture all the way, including the Genesis account, or will we compromise and make common cause with atheists?

There are only two kinds of people: those who believe in transcendent moral values and those who do not. We live in a polarized society, and a house divided against itself cannot stand; but perhaps by the grace of God we can restore our lost unity. Be that as it may, we must follow Christ's example: if we are not for Him, we are against Him; if we do not gather, we scatter. This is another kind of winnowing, the separating of wheat from chaff, and sheep from goats. We come not to bring peace, but a sword. We must be prudent, but not faint-hearted, for the issue has been raised; the battle has been joined. Let us pick up the sword and face the foes of Christ!

## REFERENCES

- <sup>1</sup> Stearns, Raymond P.; 1961; *Pageant of Europe*; Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.; New York; pp. 209-214.
- <sup>2</sup> Russett, Cynthia Eagle; 1976; *Darwin In America: The Intellectual Response 1865-1912*; W.H. Freeman and Company; San Francisco; p. 7.
- <sup>3</sup> Hedtke, Randall; 1981; The Episteme Is the Theory; *Creation Research Society Quarterly*; June, vol. 18, no. 1; p. 9. [His reference is Appleman, P. (ed.); 1970; *Darwin — A Norton Critical Edition*; W.W. Norton Co., Inc.; p. 633.]
- <sup>4</sup> Thompson, William Erwin; 1971; *At the Edge of History*; Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.; New York; p. 185.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 188.
- <sup>6</sup> Weaver, Richard M.; 1948; *Ideas Have Consequences*; University of Chicago Press; Chicago; p. 151.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 153.
- <sup>8</sup> Baker, Jeffrey J.W. and Garland E. Allen; 1971; *The Study of Biology*; Addison-Wesley Publishing Company; Reading, Massachusetts; p. 729.
- <sup>9</sup> Weaver, op. cit., p. 165.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid., pp. 158-159.
- <sup>11</sup> Weaver, Richard M.; 1953; *The Ethics of Rhetoric*; Henry Regnery Company; Chicago; p. 190.
- <sup>12</sup> Sunderland, Luther D.; 1982; Prominent British Scientists Abandon Evolution; *Origins Research*; Vol. 5, No. 1 (Winter-Spring); p. 5.
- <sup>13</sup> Sunderland, op. cit., p. 11.



- <sup>14</sup> Barlowe, Raleigh; 1978; *Land Resource Economics*; Prentice-Hall, Inc.; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey (07632); p. 400.
- <sup>15</sup> Morris, Henry M. and John C. Whitcomb, Jr.; 1961; *The Genesis Flood*; The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company; Philadelphia; p. 444. [Their reference is H.J. Muller; "Human Values in Relation to Evolution," *Science*; Vol. 127, March 21, 1958; p. 629.]
- <sup>16</sup> Ingram, T. Robert; 1976; A Most Urgent Job for Creationists in 1976; *Creation Research Society Quarterly*; Vol. 13, No. 1 (June); p. 25.
- <sup>17</sup> Hofstadter, Richard; 1959; *Social Darwinism in American Thought*; George Braziller, Publisher; New York.
- <sup>18</sup> Russett, op. cit.; p. 98.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid.; p. 88
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid.; pp. 88-89.
- <sup>21</sup> See for example G. Tyler Miller, Jr.'s *Living in the Environment*; 1975; Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.; Belmont, California.
- <sup>22</sup> Amneus, Daniel; 1979; *Back to Patriarchy*; Arlington House; New Rochelle, New York; pp. 162, 165, 168, respectively.
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid.; pp. 23, 211-212.
- <sup>24</sup> Ibid.; pp. 21-22.
- <sup>25</sup> *National Review*; January 4, 1980; The Continuing Decline; p. 15.
- <sup>26</sup> Amneus; op. cit.; pp. 47, 64-71, 104-105, 152-160
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid., pp. 138-145.
- <sup>28</sup> *National Review*; November 14, 1980; The Myths of Racial and Sexual Discrimination (Gilder); p. 1388.
- <sup>29</sup> Falwell, Jerry; 1980; *Listen, America*; Bantam Books; New York; pp. 136-142. See also Amneus; op. cit.; p. 160.
- <sup>30</sup> Amneus; op. cit.; p. 24.
- <sup>31</sup> Weaver; *Ideas Have Consequences*; op. cit., pp. 41-44.
- <sup>32</sup> Weaver; *Ideas Have Consequences*; op. cit.; p. 168.
- <sup>33</sup> Goldberg, Steven; 1973; *The Inevitability of Patriarchy*; William Morrow and Company, Inc.; New York.
- <sup>34</sup> Morris, Henry M.; 1976; *The Genesis Record*; Creation-Life Publishers; San Diego, California; p. 274.
- <sup>35</sup> Nash, George H.; 1979; *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America Since 1945*; Basic Books, Inc.; New York; p. xvi.
- <sup>36</sup> Rothbard, Murray N.; 1981; Frank S. Meyer: The Fusionist as Libertarian Manque; *Modern Age*; vol. 25, no. 4 (Fall); p. 360.
- <sup>37</sup> Ebeling, Richard; 1982; Austrian Economics: An Interview with Ludwig Lachmann; *Institute Scholar*; vol. 2, no. 2 (February); p. 7.
- <sup>38</sup> Timmerman, John H.; 1980; The Making and Meaning of Myth; *Modern Age*; vol. 24, no. 2 (Spring); p. 182.
- <sup>39</sup> Gillespie, N.C.; 1979; *Charles Darwin and the Problem of Creation*; The University of Chicago Press; Chicago; p. 15.

# Monistic Evolutionism As A Pseudo-Paradigm For Theories Of Human Action

Ellen Myers

Thomas S. Kuhn postulates that "(w)ithout commitment to a paradigm there could be no normal science."<sup>1</sup> By "paradigm" he understands a body or combination of research-governing theories. Among Kuhn's examples of paradigms is the Darwinian concept of evolution by natural selection "resulting from mere competition between organism for survival . . . in the absence of a specified goal."<sup>2</sup>

Whether Kuhn is generally correct about the need for commitment to a paradigm in the pursuit of "normal science" may be debatable. With regard to the Darwinian paradigm in particular there is much evidence to show that it is not only not needed for scientific research but may be positively misleading. Thus Professor William R. Thompson wrote in his introduction to the 1956 Everyman's Library edition of the *Origin of Species*:

Darwin's conviction that evolution is the result of natural selection, acting on small fortuitous variations, says Guyénot, was to delay the progress of investigations on evolution by half a century. Really fruitful researches on heredity did not begin until the rediscovery in 1900 of the fundamental work of Mendel, published in 1865 and owing nothing to the work of Darwin.<sup>3</sup>

The story of Gregor Mendel has been well told by Loren Eiseley who points out that "Mendel . . . had intuitively grasped what seemingly no one else of his generation understood; namely, that until we had some idea of the mechanisms which controlled organic *persistence* we would be ill-equipped to understand what it was that produced evolutionary change. . . . Mendel was fascinated by stability."<sup>4</sup> In other words, by basing his research on the principle of stability or permanent norm, the exact opposite of evolution or universal flux, Mendel obtained scientifically significant results.

The science of taxonomy, or classification of biological organisms, was severely hampered by adherence to the Darwinian paradigm. Thompson devoted much space to this fact. He mentioned, for instance, that

by plausible but unconvincing arguments zoologists have "demonstrated" the descent of the Vertebrates from almost every group of the Invertebrates. During the thirty years from 1870 to 1900, there was an immense concentration of effort on embryology, inspired by the "biogenetic law." (This "law", now rejected as inaccurate, was proposed by Darwin's German popularizer Ernst Haeckel, and stated that embryonic development recapitulates an organism's evolutionary ancestry.) . . . Taxonomists also followed the trend, constructing hypothetical ancestors for their groups. . . . A long-enduring and regrettable effect of the success of the *Origin* was the addiction of biologists to unverifiable speculation.<sup>5</sup>



Thompson felt that whatever valuable information was gathered in such studies "could have been obtained more effectively on a purely objective basis."<sup>6</sup>

Classical Darwinism was gradually stripped of glaring scientific inaccuracies (such as Darwin's theories of pangenesis, saltative evolution, and sexual selection). However, Thompson's critique of the deleterious impact of classical Darwinism upon biological research is confirmed and expanded by contemporary experience with the modern neo-Darwinian paradigm. On November 5, 1981 Dr. Colin Patterson, a senior paleontologist at the British Museum of Natural History, spoke to over fifty classification specialists and guests at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. He stated that the effects of the Darwinist theory of common ancestry (shared by both classical and neo-Darwinism) upon systematics had not merely been lack of knowledge but "positively anti-knowledge." Patterson came to this conclusion based upon results obtained in research of molecular homology, and amino acid and nucleotide sequence studies.<sup>7</sup>

Another crucial example is the total absence of undisputed missing links in the fossil record despite over one hundred years of diligent worldwide search. This "stasis" in the fossil record was admitted at a conference of over 150 leading evolutionist scientists at the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago in October 1980.<sup>8</sup> According to the Darwinist paradigm innumerable such missing links should have been found due to its theory of gradual change from simple to complex organisms over eons of time. At the present time the scientific validity of the Darwinist paradigm in the natural sciences is so tenuous that alternative evolutionist paradigms are being proposed. Some scientists refuse to commit themselves to belief in any evolutionist paradigm whatever due to the apparent absence of any plausible scientific mechanisms. Yet others have turned to creationism for the same reason.<sup>9</sup>

The above information shows that there are deep problems with Darwinism as a paradigm for the natural sciences. Since Darwinism seemed to furnish a scientific (rather than metaphysical or supernatural) explanation for the development of the universe as we now observe it, students and pioneers of the social sciences — the disciplines dealing with man — have eagerly seized upon it to solidify and enhance their various theories of human action. However, neither classical nor modern Darwinism, nor any blend of Darwinism with other monist evolutionist streams of thought such as Spencerism or Lamarckism, have been able to direct the social sciences in a trustworthy manner. We shall consider the effects of Darwinism and related monistic evolutionist thought as a pseudo-paradigm for theories of human action in the remainder of this paper.

In her extensive discussion of Darwinism's impact upon politics and society Gertrude Himmelfarb speaks of Darwinism's "inadequacy as a social theory" and points out that "(i)n the spectrum of opinion that went under the name of social Darwinism almost every variety of belief was included."<sup>10</sup> Jacques Barzun found that from about the turn of our century through World War I all political parties in every European country, no matter how mutually antagonistic, "invoked Spencer and Darwin."<sup>11</sup> A British author, Greta Jones, has recently written that a comprehensive study "will . . . inevitably and rightly emphasize the fragmented, contradictory character of social Darwinism."<sup>12</sup>

Robert C. Bannister has thoroughly investigated the impact of Darwinism

and related, intermingled streams of monist evolutionism upon social movements and theories. He reports that already in the 1880s the phrase "social Darwinism" meant "brutal individualism" for some and at the same time a new rationale for social reform and class struggle for others.<sup>13</sup> This ambivalence and resulting confusion led Eric F. Goldman to distinguish between "social" and "reform" Darwinism.<sup>14</sup> In tacit disagreement with Goldman, Bannister argues that "Darwinism was neither neutral nor inherently conservative" and that the "reform" Darwinists' "theory that human control must replace the laws of nature was the accurate reading of Darwin's theory."<sup>15</sup> The overall thrust of Bannister's discussion is ■ revision of the notion, also fostered by Richard Hofstadter's classic work *Social Darwinism in American Thought*, that laissez-faire individualist competition is the correct meaning of the term "social Darwinism." However that may be, the fact is that both laissez-faire, individualist free market economists as well as their opponents have leaned upon Darwinism or related evolutionist world views to this day for epistemological support.<sup>16</sup>

While Bannister and other sources are careful to point out that Charles Darwin himself might not have endorsed certain views claimed to be derived from his writings, they also agree that there was ample room for divergent interpretations of the *Origin of Species* and the *Descent of Man*. This was evident already in the social theories of leading Darwinian evolutionists of Darwin's own generation. Thus Thomas H. Huxley, "Darwin's Bulldog," thought that Darwinian "natural selection" undergirded state socialism since nature provided examples of socialism in the societies of bees and ants. Alfred Russel Wallace on the other hand saw sharp differences between animals and men as well as between savages and civilized men, so that in his opinion natural selection did not even apply to civilized nations.<sup>17</sup> Barzun has shown in meticulous detail that such ambiguities were compounded by the lack of clarity in Darwin's writing style, by Darwin's hedging and self-contradiction, and by his vacillation over and modification of his theories in successive editions of *Origins*.<sup>18</sup>

Now a distinction between "nature" in general and "man" in particular may seem specious or objectionable to those who believe that Darwin's greatest accomplishment is his abolition of man's status as somehow essentially different from the rest of nature. Thus Eiseley concludes his admiring portrait of Darwin and his work by praising him for "one of the most tremendous insights ■ living being ever had." It was the vision of man's and animals' "origin in one common ancestor — we may be all melted together." Eiseley commends this "statement of almost clairvoyant perception" and regrets that "very few youths today . . . are capable of saying to themselves, 'We are all one — all melted together.'" <sup>19</sup> (He wrote this before the spread of monistic pantheistic and occult thought and Eastern religious mysticism among Western young people in the 1960s and '70s.) Yet it is just this purported essential oneness between man and nature which lies at the root of the real and overwhelming problems with applying Darwinism and other varieties of monistic evolutionism to human action.

Darwin himself laid his finger on the fundamental trouble with monistic evolutionism. In 1881 he wrote in a private letter:

But then with me the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of the lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one



trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?<sup>20</sup>

This statement points to another problem for man related to his doubtful status within nature. Since man must determine what human action shall count as "right" or "wrong," he must decide which aspects of nature, both outside and within himself, he should choose as guides. But since nature presents mutually contradictory behavior of ruthlessness and brutality "red in tooth and claw" as well as of empathy and cooperation, diametrically opposite choices for human individual and social action are plausible and of equal "validity." We have seen this dilemma already with the individualist and socialist schools of economics. A similar situation prevails with regard to war. Both defenses and rejections of war and imperialist or racist policies based on Darwinism and related monistic evolutionist thought are described in many sources for this paper. The most detailed discussion of this area is given by Bannister,<sup>21</sup> and especially by Richard Hofstadter in a brilliant analysis of racism and imperialism from 1898 to the end of World War I.<sup>22</sup> It is worth quoting Hofstadter's concluding paragraph almost in full:

Vernon Kellogg, a biologist who had become acquainted with several German military leaders while serving under Herbert Hoover in Belgium during the First World War, reported in ■ volume on his experiences that the philosophy of the foe was a crude Darwinism ruthlessly applied to the affairs of nations. Coming to the attention of William Jennings Bryan, Kellogg's book reinforced his fundamentalist conviction of the inherent evilness of evolutionary ideas and his determination to wage a crusade against them. . . . For many years Bryan had been troubled about the possible social implications of Darwinism. In 1905 E.A. Ross, then teaching at Nebraska University, had found Bryan reading *The Descent of Man*, and Bryan had told him that such teachings would "weaken the cause of democracy and strengthen class pride and the power of wealth." Here, as in other matters, Bryan had sound intuitions that his intellect had not the power to discipline.<sup>23</sup>

The development of racist attitudes can also be traced directly to monistic evolutionism seeing man as simply an extension of the rest of nature, and of the animal realm in particular. The relative "progress" up from animal status made by various branches of mankind then becomes the "standard" of realized humanhood. This is exactly the way in which early (nineteenth-century) anthropology applied the Darwinist paradigm to classify human societies according to their supposed ascending stages of civilization, placing Western civilization at the top. Civilization was held to be ■ function of innate racial aptitude. This school of anthropology persisted until Franz Boas initiated the new anthropology . . . in which the simple evolutionary dogmas, the egotistical European judgments of primitives, and the mechanical notions of culture by diffusions and imitation were discarded in favor of renewed empirical observation.<sup>24</sup>

Boas did not deny the cultural superiority of Europeans but attributed it "to the circumstances of their historical development rather than to inherent capacities."<sup>25</sup> Racist tendencies in anthropology were arrested by Boas and his successors (such as Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict). However, modern anthropology is still committed to monist evolutionism (usually neo-Darwinism), and has therefore replaced the "standard" of cultural stages and

racial aptitude by a thoroughgoing cultural and historical relativism proclaiming that no culture or custom is better or worse than any other. Obviously this relativism is also consistent with monist evolutionism in which all phenomena of all-embracing "nature" are essentially one.

Thomas H. Huxley gradually and reluctantly concluded that ethical relativism or even a total ethical void is inevitable in a Darwinist evolutionist world. In his essay "The Struggle for Existence in Human Society" (1888) and especially in his famous Romanes lecture on "Evolution and Ethics" (May 1893) Huxley denied that man could be guided by nature. He also noted in his essay that Darwinism did not necessarily imply progress, but that "retrogression was as likely a phase of evolution as progression."<sup>26</sup> He was thus among the first to oppose the evolutionist optimism of his time, which has been exploded by the social catastrophes of our own century.

Huxley also was among the first to recognize the deep and perennial danger to mankind from the arrogance and fundamental ignorance of an elite among men aspiring to direction of the future. He warned against "the regimentation of the . . . eugenicists, who would try to enforce upon society the notions of fit and unfit derived from nature. . . . It was dangerous . . . to assume that any one man or group of men could have so preternatural an intelligence as to enable them to determine the 'points' of a good or bad citizen, in the way breeders judge the points of a calf."<sup>27</sup> Huxley's prophetic fear is echoed by a thoughtful twentieth-century historian of Darwinist thought, John C. Greene:

Man's increasing mastery of nature did not imply his increasing mastery of himself. To the very end many remained the creature as well as the creator of human progress. Every step upward in the knowledge and control of nature augmented his power for evil along with his power for good. Whether one expected this growing power to be used for good rather than evil depended in the last analysis on one's estimate of human nature.<sup>28</sup>

These warnings were well founded. Already in Huxley's lifetime the "eugenicists" whom he suspected of dangerous elitist ambitions had begun their work. The founder of the eugenics movement was a cousin of Charles Darwin, Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911). Mark A. Haller writes that

In its modern guise . . . eugenics was the legitimate offspring of Darwinian evolution, a natural and doubtless inevitable outgrowth of currents of thought that developed from the publication in 1859 of Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*.<sup>29</sup>

In support of this statement Haller cites the following words of Darwin from the *Descent of Man*:

We civilized men . . . build asylums for the imbecile, the maimed, and the sick; we institute poor-laws; and our medical men exert their utmost skill to save the life of every one to the last moment . . . Thus the weak members of civilized societies propagate their kind. No one who has attended to the breeding of domestic animals will doubt that this must be highly injurious to the race of man.<sup>30</sup>

Galton "claimed that eugenics was practical Darwinism. His intention was . . . 'to see what the theory of heredity, of variations and the principle of natural selection mean when applied to Man.' "<sup>31</sup> According to Jones, eugenics was "a combination of the language of natural selection with highly partial and contentious social judgments on the relative worth of different sections of the



population."<sup>32</sup> Jones also points out the connection between Darwinism, eugenics and the population theories of Thomas Malthus.<sup>33</sup> Bannister reports that since about 1910 historians "have viewed eugenics as the most enduring form of social Darwinism, indeed perhaps the only true form."<sup>34</sup> He ranks eugenicists with the reform Darwinists, but "they differed from those who preferred environmental or sociological reforms in that they preferred to work directly on man's physical constitution . . . eugenicists attempted literally to weed the human garden."<sup>35</sup>

The eugenics movement was the first large-scale attempt by a self-styled elite among men to treat their fellow men as "nothing-but" nature, as domestic animals to be bred or as ■ garden to be weeded. By operating under the Darwinist evolutionist paradigm with its purported scientific validity, they could and did see themselves quite sincerely (and were widely accepted) as the scientific guardians and promoters of evolutionary progress. Their duty, as they saw it within the monist evolutionist scheme, was the transvaluation of Western traditional civilization and its supposedly obsolete virtue of charity towards the weak. They also took it upon themselves to select the humans "worthy" to be propagated, and those "unworthy" and therefore to be eliminated. They called this choice "positive" and "negative" eugenics, a terminology going back to Francis Galton.<sup>36</sup>

The most influential eugenics organization in the world was established in the United States, and enjoyed its greatest success between 1905 and 1930. It then faded into relative obscurity until its resurgence in connection with modern genetic engineering, sociobiology, and a neo-Malthusian push for population control. In describing the latter development, Ted Howard and Jeremy Rifkin have written:

The concept of perfecting the human race (or parts of it) through biological redesign has spawned some of the most controversial and brutal social and political movements of the twentieth century. . . . This symbiotic relationship between genetic engineering and social policies and visions, each feeding on the other, each unable to exist without the other, found its high-water mark in the genetic policies of Hitler's Third Reich between 1932 (sic) and 1945.

What is less well known is that long before Hitler's rise to power, American geneticists and social ideologues had begun working closely together to fashion similar technologies and programs . . .<sup>37</sup>

Galton's rationale for a eugenics program was expressed in explicit monist evolutionist and racist terms:

There is nothing either in the history of domestic animals or in that of evolution to make us doubt that a race of sane men may be formed, who shall be as much superior mentally and morally to the modern Europeans, as the modern European is to the lowest of the Negro races.<sup>38</sup>

Galton proceeded with ■ transvaluation of civilization and charity anticipating Nietzsche and Hitler. "Charity, said Galton, should

help the strong rather than the weak, and the man of tomorrow rather than the man of today . . . there exists a sentiment for the most part quite unreasonable against the gradual extinction of an inferior race.<sup>39</sup>

In the late 1880s the German scientist August Weismann showed experimentally that characteristics acquired from the environment could not be inherited. His work was "wrongly applied by many to justify ■ rigid hereditarianism . . . many (geneticists) . . . became pessimistic about . . . improving defective

individuals through environmental agencies, a pessimism which heightened their interest in eugenics as a method to improve the race."<sup>40</sup> Eugenacists came to look upon their programs as the fulfillment of "a religious duty imposed by the theory of evolution, many of them even calling the movement a secular religion."<sup>41</sup>

Eugenacists put earlier racial theories into an evolutionary framework. "Following a common misinterpretation of Darwinism, they postulated a unilinear vertical progression from the lowest to the highest."<sup>42</sup> At the top were the "Nordics," "a very tall race of blue-eyed blonds . . . In general, eugenacists believed that the 'Nordic' race possessed a monopoly of desirable characteristics, physical and mental, thereby standing as the superior race."<sup>43</sup> Even Southern and Eastern Europeans were deemed of inferior stock.

Eugenics' "finest hour" arrived in 1924 when an immigration law was passed by Congress due to eugenacists' efforts. The law restricted immigration to 2 percent of the foreign-born from each country according to the 1890 census in order to preserve a "nordic" balance among the American population. This law remained in effect until 1965.<sup>44</sup>

American eugenacists also brought about the enactment of sterilization laws in thirty states between 1907 and 1931. The guiding spirit behind this drive was Harry H. Laughlin, assistant director of the prestigious Eugenics Record Office in Cold Springs Harbor, New York. Laughlin drafted a model law calling for the sterilization of

all those who were potential parents of socially inadequate offspring.

The socially inadequate, by his definition, consisted of the feeble-minded, insane, criminalistic ("including the delinquent and wayward"), epileptic, inebriate, diseased, blind, deaf, deformed, and dependent ("including orphans, ne'er-do-wells, the homeless, tramps and paupers").<sup>45</sup>

"American laws . . . were pioneering ventures watched by eugenists of other lands."<sup>46</sup> In Canada Alberta and British Columbia passed sterilization laws in 1928 and 1933. Denmark passed the first sterilization law in Europe, followed by Finland, Sweden, Norway and Iceland.<sup>47</sup> The English eugenacists, by contrast, never enjoyed significant political or scientific influence.<sup>48</sup>

The Nazis launched their sterilization program in 1933. In 1936, "the University of Heidelberg awarded an honorary degree to Harry Laughlin for his great contribution to the field of eugenics."<sup>49</sup> The ill repute of the Nazi eugenics program in both its bizarre "positive" and especially its infamous "negative" aspects finally brought the worldwide eugenics movement to a temporary halt.<sup>50</sup>

The connection between National Socialism and Darwinism probably does not come as a surprise to anyone. The chief popularizer of Darwinist evolutionism and related evolutionist thought in Germany was Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919). He was a noted zoologist who taught at the University of Jena most of his adult life. His first book, *Generelle Morphologie*, published in 1866, was an attempt

to subsume all of science under Darwinian principles and guidelines . . .

Along with his social Darwinist followers, he set about to demonstrate the "aristocratic" and non-democratic character of the laws of nature . . . up to his death in 1919, Haeckel contributed to that special variety of German thought which served as the seed-bed for National Socialism. He became one of Germany's major ideologists for racism, nationalism,



and imperialism.<sup>51</sup>

Haeckel's reputation as a scientist attracted many German teachers and academicians to his pantheist, monist and mystic-romantic brand of Darwinism. He propagated his thought through his work in zoology, but especially in his widely read books. The most famous of these is the *Weltraetsel (Riddle of the Universe)*, which was first published in 1899. It quickly became Germany's most popular philosophical work, sold more than a hundred thousand copies in the first year after its appearance, was translated into about twenty-five languages, and almost half a million copies had been bought in Germany alone by 1933.<sup>52</sup>

The *Weltraetsel* announced that the science of nature offered ■ modern religious faith, a message welcomed by "large segments of the semi-educated masses of the German population." Haeckel's followers saw him as their emancipator from the shackles of Biblical Christianity (much as Darwin's early followers saw Darwin); they also received him as ■ prophet of the national and racial regeneration of Germany. One reader of the *Weltraetsel* acknowledged his debt to this book as having shown him how the Germanic races "were without doubt at the highest stage of evolution."<sup>53</sup>

Eventually Haeckel founded the International Monist League (Monistenbund) on January 11, 1906 ■ Jena. Its first president was a radical Protestant theologian, Dr. Albert Kalthoff. Other important participants included well-known German romantic novelists and literary critics; Dr. Arnold Dodel, an early exponent of Haeckelian Darwinism; Dr. Johannes Unold, who had written on evolution and politics; and the German Nobel-Prize winning chemist, Wilhelm Ostwald, who directed the Monist League with Haeckel's assent after 1911. Within its first five years the Monist League grew to some six thousand members and maintained local group meetings in about forty-two localities throughout Germany and Austria. It published a monthly journal, later appearing weekly under the title *Das Monistische Jahrhundert (The Monist Century)*, as well as pamphlets and ■ youth magazine, *Sonne (Sun)*. It also disseminated its philosophy through the "Weimar Kartel," an umbrella organization for various free-thought movements endeavoring to "centralize opposition to the Christian churches and to organize systematic departure from the traditional faiths."<sup>54</sup> In September, 1911, an International Congress of Monism was held in Hamburg, "with delegates from all over the world including the American free thinker from the University of Chicago, Thaddeus Burr Wakeman, and Paul Carus, editor of the Chicago based journal, *The Monist*."<sup>55</sup>

Pursuant to the doctrines of Haeckelian Darwinism, "the most important social consequence of Darwinism and evolutionary biology was its demonstration of the animal origin and nature of man. . . . it was this incontestable fact which invalidated all traditional conceptions of his political and social possibilities."<sup>56</sup> The Christian concept of man's creation in the image of God according to the Bible was of course rejected totally. " 'Natural selection in the struggle for life,' Haeckel wrote, 'acts so as ■ transform human society just as it modifies animals and plants.' . . . To the Monists . . . civilization as a distinctively human creation literally did not exist."<sup>57</sup> Daniel Gasman perceptively contrasts the Monists with Sigmund Freud and his followers,

who under the influence of the new biology also turned their attention to the importance of the biological and instinctual nature of man. Whereas Freud, however, sought to caution society . . . of the danger inherent in

allowing man's animal and sexual instincts to have free reign, the Monists . . . argued . . . (that man) could only weaken himself by attempting to impose upon life an erroneous intellectualism and rationalism. . . . For Haeckel and the Monists . . . there could be no humanistic cultural triumph over the forces of man's animal nature and character.<sup>58</sup>

The Monists opposed all ideas of mankind's essential equality, opting instead for racism based on external physical characteristics. They also saw individual human persons as useful only within ■ context of subservience and usefulness to "its own species and to the evolution of life in general."<sup>59</sup> The Monists gloried in the fact that they had no absolute ethics, believing like Huxley, but without qualms, that no objective values could be found in nature. Like early anthropologists such as Cesare Lombroso in Italy and Karl Pearson in England who used the now thoroughly discredited technique of "anthropometry" to measure people's worth, Haeckel and the Monists believed that ■ person's physical appearance truly showed his or her inward qualities.

The Monists attacked Christianity's teaching of the unique and inviolable worth of each and every human being derived from man's creation in the image of the transcendent, personal God of the Bible, because this doctrine had "mistakenly protected the weak members of society."<sup>60</sup> Haeckel's *Weltraetsel* "became, by its popularity, the anti-Christian manifesto *par excellence* of the first decade of this century."<sup>61</sup> The Monists saw their evolutionist scheme as a religion of pantheism. Their philosophy is consistent with Darwinism and also with panpsychism and vitalism, and with evolution by occult "forces." Not surprisingly, Haeckel adhered to biological theories of the German evolutionist poet, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, of Darwin's predecessor Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, and he was "one of the major intellectual mentors of Germany's leading theosophist, Rudolf Steiner. In the 1890's both Steiner and Haeckel corresponded with one another and both wrote that they shared ■ common basic outlook on the nature of the world."<sup>62</sup> In the last year of his life Haeckel

became a member of the newly formed *Thule Gesellschaft*, a secret, radically right-wing organization which played a key role in the establishment of the Nazi movement. Other members of the *Thule* included future Nazis like Dietrich Eckart, Gottfried Feder, and Rudolf Hess. Hitler and Anton Drexler attended meetings of the *Thule* as guests.<sup>63</sup>

Haeckel and the Monists stood for authoritarian state power in a fascist-style corporative and racist state, seeing its evolutionary rationale in the societies of bees and ants (just as Huxley had done for socialism). They embraced a return to brutality in human relations and especially in government policies toward the eugenically undesirable. "For most of the Monists, the main task of the state was to insure the survival and reproduction of only the biologically fittest individuals."<sup>64</sup>

Far in advance of not only the Nazi policy of extermination of the "unfit," but also of similar attitudes among doctors, judges, legislators and philosophers in America and the world today, Haeckel asserted that "the 'destruction of abnormal new-born infants' could not be 'rationally' classified as 'murder' as is 'done in modern legal works.' One should regard it rather . . . as a 'practice of advantage both to the infants destroyed and to the community.'"<sup>65</sup> This philosophy was spelled out in detail by a German jurist, Professor Karl Binding, and Professor and Doctor of Medicine Alfred Hoche in their book *The Release of the Destruction of Life Devoid of Value*, published in 1920, the year

after Haeckel's death.<sup>66</sup> Leo Alexander, an official American medical expert at the German Doctors Trial in Nuremberg after World War II, has written:

Even before the Nazis took open charge in Germany, a propaganda barrage was directed against the traditional compassionate . . . attitudes toward the chronically ill . . . Sterilization and euthanasia of persons with chronic mental illnesses was discussed at a meeting of Bavarian psychiatrists in 1931. By 1936 extermination of the physically or socially unfit was so openly accepted that its practice was mentioned incidentally in an article published in an official German medical journal.<sup>67</sup>

The much publicized April 1982 case of "Infant Doe" in Bloomington, Indiana, constitutes a revival of such beliefs and practices. In this instance, a newborn baby with Down's Syndrome (mongolism) and also a life-endangering obstruction of the esophagus was permitted by the Indiana Supreme Court to be "medically treated" by starvation ending in death, although the esophagus obstruction could have been surgically corrected. In view of this and similar instances (though the Infant Doe case is the first one in American jurisprudence with court approval), the following statement by Hoche in 1920 is representative of both the "old" and the "new" mentality towards weak and defenseless members of mankind:

There were times . . . when the elimination of babies born unviable or persons who later became unviable were quite common. Then came the phase . . . during which the support of every existence — no matter how worthless — has become the highest moral norm. A new time will come when we no longer in the name of higher morality will carry out this demand that has its origin in an exaggerated idea of humanity.<sup>68</sup>

The Nazis' idea for a "final solution" for the "unfit" was shared by the Swiss eugenicist and Monist, Dr. August Forel. He wrote in 1937 that "modern science had to know 'which races can be of service in the further evolution of mankind, and which are useless. And if the lowest races are useless, how can they be gradually extinguished.' "<sup>69</sup> Many other direct personal and organizational links between Monism and National Socialism have been painstakingly researched by Gasman, who also shows that anti-semitism was common to both. Gasman refers to Hitler's own exposure to Haeckel as proven, for instance, by Hitler's knowledge of Haeckel's opposition to Christianity.<sup>70</sup>

Of particular interest to the present discussion is the monist-evolutionist philosophy of history common to both Haeckel and Hitler. The English historian, Norman Cohn, thought that Hitler's philosophy had "a certain crazy originality. As Hitler sees it, human history forms part of nature . . . Nature demands inequality, hierarchy, subordination of the inferior to the superior — but human history consisted of a series of revolts against this natural order . . ." Gasman rightly denies that "crazy originality" on the part of Hitler was involved in this philosophy; it rather was "only a simple repetition of Haeckel's historical views."<sup>71</sup> Like Haeckel, and for that matter like Darwin, Hitler

stressed and singled out the idea of biological evolution as the most forceful weapon against traditional religion and he repeatedly condemned Christianity for its opposition to the teachings of evolution. For Hitler evolution was the hallmark of modern science and culture, and he defended its veracity as tenaciously as Haeckel.<sup>72</sup>

The basic problem for man at the center of all monistic evolutionism —



man's place within "nature" — also plagued Haeckel and the Nazis. Although Darwinism was part of the biology curriculum in Germany's public schools under the Nazis, Haeckel's work was hardly mentioned except for presentation of his now discredited "biogenetic law." This was because the Nazis were reluctant to mention the descent of the vaunted Aryan "race" from inferior animal stock. Gasman's concluding sentence is relevant not only to Haeckel and Hitler but to all monist evolutionists: "Haeckel and the Monists had also tried to disseminate their belief in man's immutability in a world which by the fundamental tenets of their own theory was assumed to be constantly in motion."<sup>73</sup>

The acceptance of certain basic ideas of Darwinism and related monist evolutionism by Karl Marx and his followers has been investigated and confirmed many times. Marx praised Darwin's *Origin of Species* in particular because "the death blow (is) dealt here for the first time to teleology in the natural sciences."<sup>74</sup> Gasman states that Marx discovered in Darwinism "a scheme of development, similar to his own, which excluded the intervention of both God and man. For Darwin, nature evolved inexorably and alone, free of outside interference. For Marx, the course of history was determined largely by the unconscious operation of the forces and relations of material production."<sup>75</sup> In Marxism, or "dialectic materialism", we thus encounter a form of monist evolutionism which is no longer troubled at all about the implications of man's essential oneness with nature. For Marxists, this essential oneness of man with nature does not impede in the least human elitist direction of the future evolutionary process. It is taken for granted that such direction of the future is in the hands of a human elite, the Communist Party or "vanguard of the proletariat," which may and indeed must inevitably treat other human beings as just so many bits of inferior, expendable nature. Hence the torture chambers, show trials, and millions of corpses in the Communist Gulag empires. It is only when here and there orthodox Marxists and other materialist monist evolutionists receive a glimpse of the existence and reality of that which they deny exists — the human soul, perhaps their own soul, usually in extremity of suffering — that they may abandon their evolutionist faith. They may then, in Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's words, have their "measuring cup returned to them" in the Biblical Christian faith.<sup>76</sup>

Much additional information is available on the harmful influence of Darwinist and related monist evolutionary thought upon theories of human action. Only some of it could be introduced within the limited space of this paper. As shown, Darwinism, though increasingly untenable on purely natural scientific grounds, and though ambiguous and hazy in its key concepts, lent the prestige of supposedly proven science to monistic evolutionism. Thus it enabled the leaders of mutually opposed and sometimes ruthless and elitist social and political movements to claim a scientific justification for their systems. Darwinism aggravated and put in clear focus the reduction of man to mere "nature," a reduction inherent in all monist evolutionist thought. This reductionist view of man lies at the root of the inadequacy of Darwinism and related evolutionist thought as a paradigm for theories of human action and hence for the social sciences because these sciences center upon man himself as their object of study. This view of man also accounts for the elitist and "inhuman" aspects of eugenics, Haeckelian Monism, National Socialism and Marxism, because these movements represent most clearly the concrete application of monist

evolutionism to man seen as "nothing-but" nature.

The hostility of monist evolutionary thought in general, and Darwinism in particular, to Biblical Christianity has been referred to recurrently in this study. It has been shown that this hostility exists precisely because Biblical Christianity views man as essentially different from and superior to nature due to his creation in the image of the God of creation *ex nihilo*. The information presented in this paper about the anti-human effects of the evolutionist paradigm should be kept in mind when choosing between evolutionism and the Biblical Christian world view.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, Second Edition, Enlarged, 1970), 100.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 172.

<sup>3</sup> William R. Thompson, *Introduction to the Everyman's Library Edition of The Origin of Species* (London, England: J.M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1956, reprinted with permission by the British Evolution Protest Movement, Selsey, Sussex, England, 1967), 16.

<sup>4</sup> Loren Eiseley, *Darwin's Century* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books Edition, 1962), 208.

<sup>5</sup> Thompson, *op. cit.*, 16.

<sup>6</sup> *Idem*. This entire introduction to the *Origin of Species* is dedicated to the exposure of the many grave inadequacies of the Darwinian paradigm in biology. The author was professor of entomology at the University of Toronto, Canada, and knighted for his professional accomplishments.

<sup>7</sup> Reported in *Acts and Facts*, published by the Institute for Creation Research, 2100 Greenfield Drive, El Cajon, CA 92021, June 1982.

For other accounts dealing with the many scientific inadequacies of Darwinism in biology, see Norman Macbeth, *Darwin Retried* (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., First Delta Printing, August 1973); Anthony Standen, *Science is A Sacred Cow* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1950, Dutton Paperback, n.d.), 100-107. Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books Edition, 1958) contains a masterful critique of Darwin's work which is yet scrupulously fair to Darwin as a person.

For a revisionist view of neo-Darwinism (and classical Darwinism) from the evolutionist perspective, see Stephen Jay Gould, *Ever Since Darwin* (NY: W.W. Norton & Co., 1977, First Norton Paperback 1979).

<sup>8</sup> Reported in Roger Lewin, "Evolutionary Theory under Fire," *Science*, Vol. 210, 21 November 1980, 884. Also see Nicky Perlas, "NeoDarwinism Challenged at AAAS Annual Meeting" in *Towards*, Vol. 2, No. 2, Spring 1982, 29-31, on reconsideration of NeoDarwinism by major evolutionist scientists at a symposium on Darwinism under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Washington, D.C., January 3-8, 1982.

<sup>9</sup> The so-called "punctuated equilibrium" theory has been proposed by Stephen Jay Gould and Niles Eldredge in the late 1970s as an alternative to Darwinism. It is reminiscent of Darwin's discarded idea of saltative evolution, and also of the equally discarded "hopeful monster" theory suggested

by Dr. Richard Goldschmidt in 1940 in view of the many insurmountable difficulties with the Darwinian paradigm. For the latter, see Macbeth, *op.cit.*, Chapter 17, 152-163.

Scientists rejecting commitment to any evolutionary paradigm whatever include the French contemporary scientist Remy Chauvin, who wrote:

"... the thing which naturally exasperates the mechanists is the fact that there is no explanation... No, I have none. I simply propose to search... I think... that Darwinism, neo-Darwinism, and in great part the old forms of Lamarckianism, are nothing more than the childhood hypotheses of biology."

Quoted from Chauvin's essay in George N. Shuster and Ralph E. Thorson, editors, *Evolution in Perspective: Commentaries in Honor of Pierre Lecomte de Nouy* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1970), 69.

For scientists turning to creationism due to the absence of plausible evolutionary mechanisms, see Gary E. Parker, *From Evolution to Creation, A Personal Testimony* (San Diego, CA: Creation-Life Publishers, 1977).

<sup>10</sup> Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1962), 426, 431.

<sup>11</sup> Barzun, *op.cit.*, 94.

<sup>12</sup> Greta Jones, *Social Darwinism in English Thought* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, Inc., 1980), ix.

<sup>13</sup> Robert C. Bannister, *Social Darwinism: Science and Myth in Anglo-American Thought* (Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1979), 4.

<sup>14</sup> Eric F. Goldman, *Rendezvous With Destiny* (NY: Random House Vintage Books, 1955), 71ff.

<sup>15</sup> Bannister, *op.cit.*, 15.

<sup>16</sup> The noted free market economists of our generation, Milton Friedman of the Chicago School of economics, and Frederick A. Hayek of the Austrian School, base their systems upon explicitly evolutionist thought. So did Ludwig von Mises, the founder of the Austrian School. Cf. Gary North, *The Dominion Covenant* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1982), *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Bannister, *op. cit.*, 31, 32.

<sup>18</sup> Barzun, *op.cit.*, 74-86. Barzun concludes: "Whatever other descriptions might be preferred, the Fragmentary Man that Darwin was does not belong with the great thinkers of mankind." (85-86)

<sup>19</sup> Eiseley, *op.cit.*, 351, 352.

<sup>20</sup> Darwin's letter to W. Graham, July 3, 1881, in Francis Darwin, editor, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, Vol. I, 285 (New York: Basic Books, 1959), quoted in John C. Greene, *The Death of Adam* (Ames, IA: The Iowa State University Press, 1959), 336.

<sup>21</sup> Bannister, *op. cit.*, Chapter 12, 226-242.

<sup>22</sup> Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Boston, MA: The Beacon Press, Revised Edition, 1955), Chapter 9, 170-200. Also cf. Jones, *op. cit.*, 140-159.

<sup>23</sup> Hofstadter, *op. cit.*, 199-200.

<sup>24</sup> Barzun, *op. cit.*, 347.

<sup>25</sup> Hofstadter, *op. cit.*, 193.

<sup>26</sup> Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, 404. Also cf. Bannister, *op. cit.*, 142-150.



- 27 Himmelfarb, *op. cit.*, 407.
- 28 Greene, *op. cit.*, 337.
- 29 Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 3-4.
- 30 *Ibid.*, 4.
- 31 Jones, *op. cit.*, 99.
- 32 *Ibid.*, 101.
- 33 *Ibid.*, 102-103.
- 34 Bannister, *op. cit.*, 165.
- 35 *Ibid.*, 166.
- 36 Kenneth M. Ludmerer, *Genetics and American Society* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), 7, 8; Jones, *op. cit.*, 115.
- 37 Ted Howard and Jeremy Rifkin, *Who Shall Play God?* (NY: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1977, First Laurel Printing October 1980), 44.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 51.
- 39 *Ibid.*, 52.
- 40 Ludmerer, *op. cit.*, 39.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 17; see also statements by Galton and other leading eugenicists, *Ibid.*, 17-18.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 22.
- 43 *Idem.*
- 44 Howard and Rifkin, *op. cit.*, 66-70.
- 45 Haller, *op. cit.*, 133.
- 46 *Ibid.*, 135.
- 47 *Ibid.*, 139.
- 48 Ludmerer, *op. cit.*, 156-157.
- 49 Howard and Rifkin, *op. cit.*, 75.
- 50 For the most bizarre Nazi "positive" eugenics program, the *Lebensborn* project to breed and also to kidnap "Nordic" children, see Marc Hillel and Clarisse Henry, *Of Pure Blood*, translated from the French by Eric Mossbacher (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1976).  
For a detailed and shattering account to eliminate "useless eaters" by way of Nazi "negative eugenics" in actual practice, see Fredric Wertham, MD, *A Sign for Cain* (NY: The Macmillan Company, 1966), Ch. 9, "The Geranium in the Window."  
Wertham reports that children who had badly molded ears, or were bedwetters, or who had problems at school, and German World War I veterans who were amputees were eliminated as "useless eaters." Only a very few brave Catholic and Protestant Christian leaders dared speak out against this program.
- 51 Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origins of National Socialism: Social Darwinism in Ernst Haeckel and the German Monist League* (New York: The American Elsevier Publishing Co., 1971), xvi, xvii.
- 52 *Ibid.*, 14.
- 53 *Ibid.*, 16.
- 54 *Ibid.*, 22.
- 55 Note 59 to Chapter 2, 52-53.
- 56 *Ibid.*, 31-32.
- 57 *Ibid.*, 34, 35.
- 58 *Ibid.*, 35-36. Also cf. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Freud* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presby-

- terian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1965, 1979).
- <sup>59</sup> Gasman, *op. cit.*, 48.
- <sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.
- <sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 60.
- <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, Note 44 to Chapter 3, 79.
- <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, Note 104 to Chapter 1, 30. For the *Thule Gesellschaft* as an occult group, see Louis Pauwels and Jacques Bergier, *The Morning of the Magicians* (New York: Avon Books, 1968).
- <sup>64</sup> Gasman, *op. cit.*, 91.
- <sup>65</sup> *Idem.*
- <sup>66</sup> This book has been translated from the German and reprinted in 1975 by Dr. Robert L. Sassone. It may be ordered at \$1.50 per copy (pb., ppd.) from Dr. Sassone, 900 N. Broadway, Suite 725, Santa Ana, CA 92701.
- <sup>67</sup> In the *New England Journal of Medicine*, 241:39-47, 1949, quoted in Binding and Hoche, *op. cit.*, 104, by Dr. Sassone. *Ibid.*, 40. Cf. also an editorial on "a new medical ethic" in *California Medicine*, official journal of the California Medical Association, Vol. 113, No. 3, September 1970, reprinted in full. *Ibid.*, 72-75.
- <sup>68</sup> Gasman, *op. cit.*, Note 52 to Chapter 4, 103.
- <sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 161ff.
- <sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 166.
- <sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 174.
- <sup>74</sup> Quoted in Himmelfarb. *op. cit.*, 421.
- <sup>75</sup> Gasman, *op. cit.*, 107.
- <sup>76</sup> Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, *The Gulag Archipelago*, Vol. II, Prts. III-IV (NY: Harper & Row, 1975), 611 ff. Poem on p. 614-615.

Clip and mail to: **CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE  
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY**  
1429 N. Holyoke  
Wichita, Kansas 67208

☐ *Enclosed is my payment of \$12\* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's **Statement of Belief**:*

1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

\*( $\$13$  U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of  $\$14$  (foreign,  $\$15$  U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly** (to run through September 1983).

Mail to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_



EDITORIAL

*page 1*

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

*page 2*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

*page 2*

IS CREATION MORE THAN A BIOLOGICAL MODEL OF ORIGINS?

*Ralph E. Ancil*

*page 3*

MONISTIC EVOLUTIONISM AS A PSEUDO-PARADIGM

*Ellen Myers*

*page 14*

Creation Social Science  
& Humanities Society  
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610  
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Wichita, Kansas  
Permit No. 929